

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the Amendment filed on January 26, 2005, claims 1, 2 and 5-33 will be all the claims pending in the application.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 2 would not overcome the rejection over Friedlander in view of the teaching at col. 3, lines 43-48.

It is respectfully submitted that Friedlander is silent with respect to the molar ratio concerning the compound having alkenyl ether group bonded directly to the unsaturated polyester or polyester polyether of the present invention. That is, although Friedlander teaches that the ratio of carbon-carbon double bond equivalents from the vinyl ether component to carbon-carbon double bond equivalents from the unsaturated polyester component, Friedlander does not teach or suggest that the molar ratio of the terminal alkenyl ether group represented by formula (1) to the repeating unit represented by formula (2) is from 0.2 to 2, as in the present invention.

In addition, Friedlander does not teach or suggest a compound where at least one alkenyl ether group represented by formula (1) is directly bonded to the unsaturated polyester or polyester polyether as represented by formula (2) or formulae (2) and (5).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Friedlander does not teach or suggest a compound of the present invention according to claims 1 and 2, where at least one alkenyl ether group represented by formula (1) is bonded directly to the unsaturated polyester or polyester polyether as represented by formula (2) or formulae (2) and (5), and having a

molar ratio of the terminal alkenyl ether group represented by formula (1) to the repeating fumarate unit represented by formula (2) of from 0.2 to 2.

Further, the present invention provides unexpectedly superior curing properties, such as hardness. *See e.g.*, Table 6 on pages 81-82 of the present specification. Friedlander is silent with respect to the unexpectedly superior results obtained by the heat cured product of the present invention, and since Friedlander does not teach or suggest a compound having the structure or the molar ratio of the terminal alkenyl ether group of formula (1) to the repeating unit represented by formula (2) of the present invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect the heat cured product of the present invention to exhibit superior results, such as hardness, based on Friedlander.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Friedlander does not render obvious the present invention according to claims 1 or 2.

Further, each of claims 5, 6, 26, 28 and 29 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 or 2. Therefore, it is submitted that these claims are patentable over Friedlander for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 2.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 1, 2 and 5-33 are respectfully requested.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)**  
**U.S. Application No.: 10/088,229**

**Attorney Docket No.: Q61659**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiko K. Takagi  
Registration No. 47,121

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 28, 2005 (timely filed, February 26, 2005 being a Saturday)